

## REMARKS

The present Amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed on January 7, 2011.

The final Office Action maintains the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a), objects to claims 13-17, 19 and 20 and rejects claims 1, 3-12 and 22 under §103(a) over Harting in view of Pfann.

In the objection to the drawings, the Examiner asserts that the indentations and radially extending raised areas comprising the blocking elements are not shown in the drawing figures, that that the reference numbers (82, 84) merely point to a "slanted line" between first and second blocking elements (32, 34).

In response, applicants present new drawings Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C as shown in the NEW SHEET submitted herewith in an effort to clearly identify the radially extending indentations (82) and radially extending raised areas (84) in each of the first blocking element (32) and the second blocking element (34). Fig. 3A provides a side perspective view of a portion of the first blocking element (32) and second blocking element (34) partially engaged. As is seen in the lower left of Fig. 3A, a radially extending raised area (84) of second blocking element (34) is shown partially inserted into a radially extending indentation (82) in first blocking element (32).

These radially extending raised areas (84) and radially extending indentations (82) are alternately and evenly positioned about an entire outer

radial surface portion proximate each blocking element's circumferential edge. It should be clear that each radially extending indentation and raised area pair on one blocking surface is positioned to oppose each radially raised area and extending indentation pair on the other blocking surface, thereby enabling the blocking elements to mesh in an axial direction.

Fig. 3B provides a side perspective view along the line A-A in Fig. 3A, looking to the right in the figure in order to highlight a radially extending indentation (82) of second blocking element (34) in partial receipt of inserted radially extending raised area (84) in first blocking element (32). Fig. 3C provides a side perspective view of the line B-B in Fig. 3A, looking to the left in the figure in order to highlight a radially extending raised area (84) of second blocking element (34) partially inserted into a radially extending indentation (82) in first blocking element (32).

REPLACEMENT SHEETS for Fig. 1 (1/4), for Figs. 2 and 3 (2/4) and for Figs. 4 and 5 (4/4), also are included to correctly reflect that fact that there are now four sheets of drawing figures in view of the additional NEW SHEET comprising Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C. For that matter, applicants also amend the Specification as shown above to reflect the addition of Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C, and to describe the content of same.

In view of new drawing Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C, and the changes to the Specification shown above, applicants respectfully assert that the drawing figures

now comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a) and request withdrawal of the objections therefore.

In response to the objection to the claims, applicants have amended the claims identifiers where necessary to make clear that each of claims 13-21 are withdrawn.

To support the rejection under §103(a), the Examiner asserts that Harting discloses a blocking device for blocking a rotary motion of shaft [2] relative to a housing of a gear-drive unit, having a first blocking element [rotatable part 1] and a second blocking element [cam disk 3] which latter is displaceable relative to the first blocking element [rotatable part 1] by means of at least one electromagnet [5, 6, 7] and at least one restoring element [leaf spring 4], wherein the blocking elements each have radially extending indentations and radially extending raised areas, which mesh with one another in an axial direction in a form-locking fashion to block the rotary motion of the shaft in the blocking state [Fig. 3].

The Examiner further asserts that Harting does not disclose a separate, independent structural unit for mounting onto the housing and shaft, that Pfann discloses an electric motor with a brake including a housing that holds a braking or blocking portion (Fig. 3), insertable into the motor housing (Fig. 3) and that it would have been obvious to modify Harting as taught by Pfann, as an engineering design choice, so that housing with the braking or blocking device is more amenable to use with different housing constructions, to make the “system” more efficient.

In response, applicants hereby amend claim 1 to better distinguish the claimed radially extending indentations and radially extending raised areas.

Claim 1 is amended to require that the blocking elements (32, 34) each have a complete set of radially extending indentations (82) and radially extending raised areas (84), alternately and evenly positioned about an entire outer radial surface portion proximate each blocking element's circumferential edge, wherein each radially extending indentation and raised area pair on one blocking surface is positioned to oppose each radially raised area and extending indentation pair on the other blocking surface, enabling the blocking elements to mesh with one another in an axial direction and in a form-locking fashion to block the rotary motion of the shaft (14) in the blocking state, and to further require that blocking device (30) is embodied as a separate, independent structural unit (31) comprising a barrier housing (52) is mounted as a unit (31) onto and within the housing (16) on the one hand and onto the shaft (14) on the other.

These limitations, now clearly shown in new Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C, are neither taught nor suggested by Harting of Pfann.

And while Pfann's brake (10) comprises a housing as asserted, Pfann's brake (10) is separate from and outside of Pfann's motor housing (3). That is, Pfann's brake (10) is affixed to the brake mounting shield (6), which seals the end on Pfann's motor. The brake (10) attaches to the brake mounting shield (6). Applicant's blocking device (30), as distinguished, is contained within barrier

housing (52), and the barrier housing (52) is mounted as unit (31) within housing (16) and onto shaft (14).

Hence, modifying Harting by the teachings of Pfann would still not realize the invention of amended independent claim 1. It follows that claim 1, and pending claims 3-12 that depend from claim 1, are patentable under §103(a) over Harting in view of Pfann, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

To support the to rejection of claim 22, the Examiner reasserts the substance of the rejection of independent claim 1 over Harting in view of Pfann, and further asserts that while Harting fails to explicitly disclose toothing areas, axial extensions, stop disk and hook for clamping, as claimed, that Pfann teaches toothing areas (fig. 4), axial extensions (Fig. 5) where an axial extension the top portion of element (20) is braced against the bottom surface of the stop disk (6) that is clamped by the hook portion (29). The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to provide such toothing areas, axial extensions, stop disk and hook for clamping as taught by Pfann as a design choice to provide a strong connection between the blocking element, shaft and the housing and to allow for replacement of each element individually if damaged without having to replace the entire blocking system.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Pfann discloses a brake rotor (20) with first (21) and second (22) braking surfaces (see Fig. 3). A friction sheet (6) is attached to the brake by a bayonet connection. A guide ring (15) comprises

three lugs or hook portions (29) cooperates with three corresponding recesses (34) of friction sheet (6). The guiding ring (15) which forms a lid (housing for brake (10)), as explained at col. 8, lines 31-47.

Therefore, between the friction sheet (6) and the rotor (20), on the friction sheet side of braking surface (21), an axial movement of the brake rotor (20) must be available to disengage or loosen the brake between the friction sheet and the brake rotor, as distinguished from the operation of the independent claim (22) blocking device. Hence, Pfann's construction and intended operation thereby teach away from the invention, as claimed (the braking solution).

Pfann's does not teach or suggest a first blocking element [brake rotor (20)] having axial extensions which are braced on at least one axial stop to mesh in a form-locking manner (with the stop disk/barrier housing) such that the rotatable first blocking element is fixed in a certain axial position relative to the brake housing. As explained above, only part of the stationary brake housing [friction sheet (6)] is fixed to the other part [guiding ring (15)] of the stationary brake housing in a bayonet-like manner in Pfann.

Applicants respectfully assert, therefore, for at least these reasons, and for the fact that Pfann's brake (10) is affixed to the brake mounting shield 6, which seals the end on Pfann's motor, and brake (10) attaches to the brake mounting shield (6), outside of motor housing (3), claim 22 is non-obvious over Harting in view of Pfann.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 under §103(a) over Harting in view of Pfann, therefore.

It follows that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael J. Striker', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631 549 4700